



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/697,240

10/31/2003

Satoshi Arakawa

Q78212

9031

23373 7590 10/03/2007  
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

TORRES, JOSE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/03/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/697,240

**Applicant(s)**

ARAKAWA, SATOSHI

**Examiner**

José M. Torres

**Art Unit**

2624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) José M. Torres.(3) Dion Ferguson (Reg. No. 59,561).(2) Samir Ahmed (SPE).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 13 September 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Small et al., "Validation of a 3D optoelectronic motion analysis system for the wrist joint and Wang (US 2002/0076091).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 consisted of the combination of references (Small et al. in view of Wang), related to the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Final Action mailed on June 15, 2007). However, an explanation of why the combination stands was provided to the Applicant in view of Small's suggestion of using the non-invasive optoelectronic system as a clinical evaluation. Applicant was kindly advised to amend the claim to further define the invention, since Small et al. itself constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant expressed the filing of a response to the Final Action due on September 17, 2007. Therefore, once the response is filed, further prosecution on the merits will be followed as applicable.